## **REMARKS**

The Office Action of December 26, 2002, has been carefully considered. Applicant has removed the portion of claim 1 objected to by the examiner under Section 112. Applicant has added the limitation of claim 5 with further structural detail to claim 1.

Before turning to the detail of the claim, it is believed that a short discussion of the nature and purpose of applicant's invention would be in order. When utilizing a cabinet of the type shown in Figure 1, it is important that one pulling on the handle 50 not be pinched by striking the handle of an opposite drawer in the second floor based frame compartment 34. By providing a stop member which extends outwardly with respect to the front side member, such a pinching is prevented. Even if the corresponding drawer in the second floor based frame compartment 34 is partially extended, the stop arm would strike the partially opened drawer preventing any pinching.

If the stop member was inside as taught by Gemma, there would be the possibility of pinching if a drawer from the opposite compartment was partially opened. Because the stop member extends outwardly with respect to the front side, this prevents such pinching. The examiner in the Office Action of August 12, 2002, stated that it was well settled that a reversal of parts is an obvious matter of design choice referring to the stop 31-32 of Gemma. Reversing the stops in Gemma would not provide the prevention of pinching of applicant's claim 1. Gemma teaches that the stop should contact the stanchion of the inner roller assembly and putting

Gemma's stop on the roller assembly would not prevent any pinching. Applicant's provision of a roller which extends outwardly with respect to the front edge solves this problem.

Claims 6 and 7, being dependent upon claim 1 are believed allowable for that reason.

Respectfully submitted,

EDGAR W. AVERILL, JR.

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 24,752

Averill & Varn 8244 Painter Avenue Whittier, CA 90602 (562) 698-8039